

M-15140-3D US

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-3, 7-12, and 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), and claims 2, 4-6, 10, 12-14, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Claims 1, 8, 9, and 16 are amended. No new matter is added. The rejections are respectfully traversed in light of the following remarks, and reconsideration is requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a)

Claims 1, 3, 8, 9, 11, 16, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Gomi (U.S. Pat. No. 4,394,949). In rejecting the claims, the Examiner writes in part that "Gomi discloses a roll 8 . . . comprising . . . a sheet roller . . . and a plurality of salient members (raised portions on which pins 81 are mounted)".

Gomi, in Fig. 3A, discloses a "pin wheel feed mechanism" in which a pair of pin wheels 8 are mounted on ends of a drive shaft 16. The pin wheel feed mechanism is used as a paper feed, where pins 81 are matched with holes in the paper to move and paper. Thus, as clearly seen, the raised portions on which pins 81 are mounted only span the width of each pin wheel, not the entire width of the paper.

In contrast, claim 1 has been amended to recite that "the length of the salient members is approximately the width of the substrate material." Support for the amendment is found in Applicant's specification at Fig. 3 and corresponding text. Thus, no new matter is added.

Further, claim 1 recites that "each of said plurality of salient members configured to cause a fold line to form across a width of said substrate material". Gomi, on the other hand, has "salient members", which simply support the paper as it rolls through the mechanism. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner that a fold line would inherently be formed. Even if that were the case, there would be fold lines at very short intervals in the

MACPHERSON KWOK OLSEN
& HEDD LLP
1703 TECHNOLOGY DRIVE
SUITE 216
SAN JOSE, CA 95118
(408) 373-9250
FAX (408) 373-9262

M-15140-3D US

paper, which would not be a desired result of Gomi. Even further, assuming there is inherent folding, the fold line would not be across the width of the paper.

Thus, for these reasons, Gomi does not anticipate claim 1.

Independent claim 8 is similarly amended to recite that "each one of said salient members spans the width of the substrate material" and "forming a fold line across a width of said sheet of substrate material". Thus for reasons similar to claim 1, Gomi does not anticipate claim 1.

Further, claim 8 is amended to recite "increasing resistance of the substrate material to wrinkle formation", support for which is found in Applicant's specification at paragraph [0011]. Thus, no new matter is added. In contrast, the pin wheel feed mechanism of Gomi does not operate to increase resistance to wrinkle formation. Accordingly, for this additional reason, claim 8 is not anticipated by Gomi.

Independent claim 16 is amended to recite that "the length of the means for forming is approximately the width of the substrate material" and "means for forming a fold line across a width of said substrate material". Thus, for reasons similar to claim 1, Gomi does not anticipate claim 16.

Claims 3, 9, 11, and 17 depend on claims 1, 8, and 16 and are therefore patentable over Gomi for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 8, and 16.

Claims 1-3, 7-12, and 15-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Lesse (U.S. Pat. No. 4,838,468). In rejecting the claims, the Examiner writes in part that "Lesse discloses a roll 1 . . . comprising . . . a sheet roller 5 . . . and a plurality of salient members 6, 8, 9".

Lesse, in Fig. 1, discloses a rotating reel 1 with a carrier element 5, in which the ends of the carrier element 5 have L-shaped rules for transporting the material web 3. Thus, the rotating reel is NOT a cylindrical sheet roller.

M-15140-3D US

In contrast, claims 1, 8, and 16 have been amended to recite "a cylindrical sheet roller", support for which is found in Applicant's specification at Figs. 2, 3, and 4A. Thus, no new matter is added.

Therefore, because Lesse does not teach or disclose "a cylindrical sheet roller", as recited in claims 1, 8, and 16, independent claims 1, 8, and 16 are patentable over Lesse.

Claims 2, 3, 7, 9-12, 15, and 17-19 depend on claims 1, 8, and 16 and are thus patentable over Lesse for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 8, and 16.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 2, 4-6, 12-14, and 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gomi. However, as discussed above, independent claims 1, 8, and 16 are patentable over Gomi. Since claims 2, 4-6, 12-14, and 18-20 depend on claims 1, 8, and 16, claims 2, 4-6, 12-14, and 18-20 are patentable over Gomi for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 8, and 16.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

MACPHERSON KWOK CHEN
& REED LLP
1162 TECHNOLOGY DRIVE
SUITE 225
SAN JOSE, CA 95110
(408) 352-4250
FAX (408) 352-9243

M-15140-3D US

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant believes pending claims 1-20 are allowable, and a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions regarding the application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned Attorney at (949) 752-7040.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to:
Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on
the date shown below.


Monique M. Butler

March 13, 2006
Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Tom Chen
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 42,406

MACPHERSON KWOK CHEN
& HEDD LLP
1782 TECHNOLOGY DRIVE
SUITE 216
SAN JOSE, CA 95110
(408) 379-2250
FAX (408) 379-2262